

REMARKS

Claims 1-10 and 12-17 remain for further consideration. No new matter has been added.

The objections and rejections shall be taken up in the order presented in the Official Action.

3-4. Claims 1-5, 7-10 and 12-16 currently stand rejected for allegedly being obvious in view of U.S. Patent 5,867,484 to Shaunfield (hereinafter “Shaunfield”), U.S. Patent 6,035,439 to Ha (hereinafter “Ha”) and U.S. Patent 6,310,848 to Ueki (hereinafter “Ueki”).

Claim 1

Claim 1 recites a local network having a ring network configuration with a plurality of subscribers each connected within the ring network by a data line to transmit and receive data therebetween. The local network includes:

- “a first subscriber configured as a data source that transmits compressed audio and video data onto the ring network;
- a second subscriber that receives decompressed audio data;
- a third subscriber that receives decompressed video data,
- a fourth subscriber that includes
 - (i) a bit stream decoder that decodes the compressed audio and video data and provides decompressed audio and video data;
 - (ii) a separation stage that receives the decompressed audio and video data and separates the decompressed audio and video data to provide the decompressed audio data signal and the decompressed video data signal; and
 - (iii) a control unit that controls the transmission of the decompressed audio data signal and the decompressed video data signal onto the ring network.” (cl. 1).

The Official Action acknowledges that Shaunfield “...*fails to explicitly teach the first subscriber (Fig. 2 – 53) transmits compressed audio data.*” (Official Action, pg. 3). The Official Action contends that “[i]n analogous art, Ha et al (“Ha”) teaches transmitting compressed audio and

video data from a microphone and a camera (Fig. 3, col. 4, lines 1-39 – compressed audio and video are interleaved after being compressed by an audio codec and a video codec, respectively[.]” (Official Action, pg. 3). The Official Action then abruptly concludes “[t]herefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify node 53 of Shaunfield by including compressed audio data from a microphone with the video data and an audio codec for compression of the audio, as taught by Ha, in order to enhance the presentation to enhance the output signal with audio (Ha: col. 4, lines 1-30). (Official Action, pg. 4). This rationale is incorrect.

The Official Action abruptly contends that a skilled person would have modified Shaunfield to include the compressed audio data of Ha with the video data. As known, it is the duty of the Examiner to provide a reasoned statement of rejection grounded in the *Graham* inquires. In the present case the Examiner has merely stated a conclusion that a skilled person would have modified Shaunfield based upon Ha. There is no reasoned statement regarding why a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have sought to add audio to system of Shaunfield. Nor can there be any reasoned statement since Shaunfield expressly teaches away from combining video and audio. Again Shaunfield unambiguously states: “[e]ach video module includes a first codec 270 coupled to a first serial video channel 272.... [t]he codecs are of conventional design, but without provisions for processing voice analog signals.” (emphasis added, col. 21, lines 55-61). So this purposeful, express statement by Shaunfield clearly teaches away from combining video and audio.

Furthermore, a skilled person would not have sought to modify the video surveillance system of Shaunfield by adding the audio per the allegedly teachings of Ha. The Official Action contends that Shaunfield and Ha are analogous art, but this is technically incorrect and fails to

consider both references for all that they fairly teach. Shaunfield relates to a video surveillance system. Na relates to a video teleconferencing system. The systems of Shaunfield and Na are certainly not analogous technical arts. Setting aside Shaunfield's express teachings for the moment, there is certainly no reason to add audio to the video surveillance system of Shaunfield since there is no additional security benefit to be gained. In contrast, the video conferencing system of Ha requires both video and audio for a fully functioning teleconferencing system.

As a result, it is respectfully submitted that the combined teachings of Shaunfield, Na and Ueki are incapable of rendering claim 1 obvious since the combined references fail to teach the claimed feature of "*a first subscriber configured as a data source that transmits compressed audio and video data onto the ring network*" (cl. 1).

Claim 9

Claim 9 currently stands rejected in the Official Action for the same reasons as claim 1, and the arguments presented hereinabove with respect to the patentability of claim 1 are applicable to claim 9. As a result, it is submitted that the obviousness rejection of claim 9 should be removed, and that claim 9 is in condition for allowance.

Claim 16

Claim 16 currently stands rejected in the Official Action for the same reasons as claim 1, and the arguments presented hereinabove with respect to the patentability of claim 1 are applicable to claim 16. As a result, it is submitted that the obviousness rejection of claim 16 should be removed, and that claim 16 is in condition for allowance.

5. Claim 6 currently stands rejected for allegedly being obvious in view of Shaunfield, Ha, Ueki, and U.S. Patent 5,940,398 to Stiegler (hereinafter "Stiegler").

It is respectfully submitted that this rejection is moot since claim 1 is patentable for at least the reasons set forth above.

6. Claim 17 currently stands rejected for allegedly being obvious in view of U.S. Published Application 2002/0038374 to Gupta (hereinafter "Gupta") and Stiegler.

It is respectfully submitted that Stiegler is not prior art since it is commonly owned. Specifically, Stiegler and the present invention, at the time the present invention was made, were owned by, or subject to an obligation of assignment to, the same entity.

For all the foregoing reasons, reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-10 and 12-17 is respectfully requested.

If a telephone interview could assist in the prosecution of this application, please call the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Patrick O'Shea", written in dark ink. The signature is fluid and stylized, with the first name "Patrick" and last name "O'Shea" clearly legible.

Patrick J. O'Shea
Reg. No. 35,305
O'Shea Getz P.C.
1500 Main Street, Suite 912
Springfield, MA 01115
(413) 731-3100, Ext. 102